<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 11 and 24 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

<u>Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103</u>

<u>Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21 and 24-26</u>

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0156929 by Hekmatpour (hereafter referred to as "Hekmatpour"), in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2001/0045861 by Bloodworth et al. (hereafter referred to as "Bloodworth"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites method of generating a project datasheet in an integrated design environment comprising (emphasis added):

> accessing project data from an XML database structure, said project data from the integrated design environment and for describing an electronic system design for implementation on a programmable system on a chip processor, <u>wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor;</u>
> accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets; and

processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file, wherein said project datasheet file comprises said specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor.

Independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-23 and 25-26 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, project data is accessed from a database comprising data in XML format (see Figure 2B), where the project data comprises specified pinout connection data for a programmable system on a chip processor (see step 225 of Figure 2A).

The rejection states that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor" as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants concur.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bloodworth, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor" as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion of a programmable system on a chip processor in Bloodworth. Further, Applicants understand Bloodworth to teach an integrated circuit with pins for which connection data is *unspecified* (Figure 3; paragraph 17), where those pins without specified connection data

may be subsequently connected by blowing fuses connecting various circuits to the unspecified pins (Figures 4 and 5; paragraph 18). As such, Bloodworth teaches away from specified pinout connection data as claimed by teaching pins with *unspecified connections* that can be subsequently configured by blowing fuses.

Furthermore, neither Hekmatpour not Bloodworth teach or suggest specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor which is stored in XML format as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, neither Hekmatpour not Bloodworth teach or suggest that the specified pinout connection data is converted from XML project data to a project datasheet file as recited in Claim 1.

Additionally, page 3 of the rejection states that the motivation for combining Hekmatpour and Bloodworth in the claimed fashion is to allow "a user to easily view integrate [sic] circuit block locations." As discussed in MPEP §2143, "there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings." Applicants respectfully assert that neither Hekmatpour nor Bloodworth teach or suggest the ability for a user to easily view integrated circuit block locations. Since the proposed motivation to combine the two references is not found in the references, it is presumed by Applicants that the Examiner is relying upon knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to support the proposed motivation to combine Hekmatpour and Bloodworth. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner either provide documentary evidence of such general knowledge in the art or provide a declaration or

affidavit supporting the proposed motivation, in accordance with MPEP §2144.04(C), if the rejection combining Hekmatpour and Bloodworth is to be maintained in the next Office Action.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 are also not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth. Therefore, Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are allowable.

<u>Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22</u>

Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,748,569 to Brooke (hereafter referred to as "Brooke"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Brooke for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Brooke, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Bloodworth, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Bloodworth combination discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1, 11, 17 and 24. Specifically, Brooke fails to teach or suggest the limitations "wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor" as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Brooke. Thus, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record, and are therefore allowable.

Claim 10

Claim 10 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,704,893 to Bauwens (hereafter referred to as "Bauwens"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 10 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Bauwens for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that Bauwens, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Bloodworth, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Bloodworth combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Bauwens fails to teach or suggest the

limitations "wherein said project data comprises specified pinout connection data for said programmable system on a chip processor" as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claim 10 recites further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, Claim 10 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Bloodworth and further in view of Bauwens. Thus, Claim 10 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and is therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: __3/8__, 2007   _BMF_____

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060